

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,787,421 ("Nomiyama") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,913,215 ("Rubinstein"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

In a preferred embodiment, the document retrieval apparatus has a query character string input unit 21, a document select unit 22, a retrieval result output unit 23, a document output unit 24, and a document database 25. The query character string input unit 21 receives an input of multiple search keywords, the document select unit 22 selects documents that match the input search keywords from the document database 25, as explained in more detail in the specification, pages 19+. The claimed invention should not be limited, however, to the preferred embodiments described and shown in the specification and drawings.

Claim 1 says the document retrieval apparatus has "a query character string input unit that accepts an input of a query character string including a plurality of retrieval keywords." This is an important feature of the invention. The Office Action cites to portions of Nomiyama which only indicate that the user of the Nomiyama system inputs "a keyword," *see also* FIGS. 3-4. This is different than the claimed invention in which the user may input multiple retrieval keywords and the document select unit retrieves the documents that match the keywords. The Office Action relies on Rubinstein as only teaching the highlighting of keywords in the retrieved documents. For this reason, claim 1 should be allowable over the Nomiyama and Rubinstein combination.

Claims 4 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nomiyama in view of Rubinstein and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0174118 ("Bates"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 4 and 16 either depend from claim 1 or contain similar limitations as claim 1. Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the Nomiyama and Rubinstein combination. Therefore, claims 4 and 16 should be allowable for reasons mentioned above and for other reasons.

Claims 5, 6, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nomiyama in view of Rubinstein and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,907,836 ("Sumita"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 5, 6, 17 and 18 either depend from claim 1 or contain similar limitations as claim 1. Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the Nomiyama and Rubinstein combination. Therefore, claims 5, 6, 17 and 18 should be allowable for reasons mentioned above and for other reasons.

Claims 7 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nomiyama in view of Rubinstein and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,168,565 ("Morita"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 7 and 19 either depend from claim 1 or contain similar limitations as claim 1. Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the Nomiyama and Rubinstein combination. Therefore, claims 7 and 19 should be allowable for reasons mentioned above and for other reasons.

Claims 8, 9, 20, 21, 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nomiyama in view of EAST. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 8, 9, 20, 21, 25 and 26 either depend from claim 1 or contain similar limitations as claim 1. Nomiyama does not disclose, teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, claims 8, 9, 20, 21, 25 and 26 should be allowable for reasons mentioned above and for other reasons.

In view of the above, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: July 5, 2007

Respectfully submitted,
By _____
Mark J. Thronson
Registration No.: 33,082
Ranga Sourirajan
Registration No.: 60,109
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1825 Eye Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-5403
(202) 420-2200
Attorneys for Applicant